Message

**From:** Strynar, Mark [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=5A9910D5B38E471497BD875FD329A20A-STRYNAR, MARK]
**Sent:** 2/25/2016 3:07:23 PM
**To:** Hillary Stoll [hjstoll@ncsu.edu]
**Subject:** RE: WAX versus HLB

I have been able to make the 3cc syringe style work today with the WAX. I can do the same with the strata X.

Mark

**From:** Hillary Stoll [mailto:hjstoll@ncsu.edu]
**Sent:** Thursday, February 25, 2016 10:01 AM
**To:** Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>
**Cc:** Detlef Knappe <knappe@ncsu.edu>; Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>
**Subject:** Re: WAX versus HLB

Hello Mark,

I think we talked about that last week. Didn't we come to the conclusion that Strata doesn't offer the preferred type of cartridge, though? If they do, I would also like to do a comparison.

Thanks,
Hillary

On Thursday, February 25, 2016, Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov> wrote:

> Hillary,
>
> I would also like to do a side by side comparison of the Phenomenex Strata X SPE cartridges compared to the WAX SPE. I have 25-30 of the Strata X to test. I am told they are significantly less expensive. If they perform the same we may want to switch.
>
> Mark
>
> **From:** Hillary Stoll [mailto:hjstoll@ncsu.edu]
> **Sent:** Wednesday, February 24, 2016 8:53 PM
> **To:** Detlef Knappe <knappe@ncsu.edu>
> **Cc:** Strynar, Mark <Strynar.Mark@epa.gov>; Lindstrom, Andrew <Lindstrom.Andrew@epa.gov>
> **Subject:** Re: WAX versus HLB

Hello Dr. Knappe,

That is my next step, along with Mark's suggestions. Hopefully I can draw more conclusions regarding the response factors from this improved data.

Best,

Hillary

On Wednesday, February 24, 2016, Detlef Knappe <knappe@ncsu.edu> wrote:

> Thank you for the update, Mark. This sounds promising!
> Hillary, can you take a look at response factors for these results?
> Thank you,
> Detlef
>
> On 2/24/16 2:20 PM, Strynar, Mark wrote:
>
> > FYI,
> >
> > I looked at the work we did yesterday. The WAX worked very well for all, and the HLB did poorly for m/z 229 and 279 which are PFECA F and A respectively. HLB worked similarly for all others compared to the WAX. As expected the HLB does poorly for the low molecular weight PFCAs and the PFECAs. The A and F PFECA are the two smallest. I propose using WAX capture of the compounds in 500 mL of water and a UPLC MS/MS analysis on the Acquity system.
> >
> > There was some contamination of the PFECA G compound in the MB but not other compounds. I think we can work with this small amount as it was lower than the lowest curve point (10 ng/L).
> >
> > We will now need to do more like 6-7 point cal curves and try to add some ISs we have (PFBA, PFHxA and PFOA) to serve as IS in the absence of matched IS compounds.
> >
> > Mark

--
Detlef Knappe
Professor
319-E Mann Hall
Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering
North Carolina State University
Campus Box 7908
Raleigh, NC 27695-7908

Phone: 919-515-8791
Fax: 919-515-7908
E-mail: knappe@ncsu.edu
Web page: http://knappelab.wordpress.ncsu.edu/

--

Hillary Stoll

Graduate Research Assistant

319-A Mann Hall

North Carolina State University

Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering

Raleigh, NC 27695-7908

(402) 304-4037 | hjstoll@ncsu.edu

--

Hillary Stoll
Graduate Research Assistant
319-A Mann Hall
North Carolina State University
Department of Civil, Construction, and Environmental Engineering
Raleigh, NC 27695-7908
(402) 304-4037 | hjstoll@ncsu.edu